



> Indonesia (65,910 !), and even Spain (38,902).  
>  
> We can have different opinions, but there is no excuse for  
> screwing up the facts that badly.  
>  
>  
> Mike Silva, KK6GM

The call book I have says "North American" on it, not US. Maybe  
different publishers...

However;

From: kawai@Csl.Stanford.EDU (goh kawai - n6uok)

>Finally, a note on JA ham population: Dan says he thinks Japan has three  
>million hams. To be more accurate, there are just over one and a half  
>million stations currently licensed (JARL statistics, fall 1993). There  
>are over two million individuals who have operator licenses. The reason  
>why the numbers don't match is because station licenses and operator  
>licenses are completely distinct, and must be applied for separately.  
>Many people join a club station instead of applying for their personal  
>callsign. Estimates based on license issuance and amateur equipment  
>sales suggest that about ten percent of Class 4 licensees are active on  
>HF.

>  
>For your info, I have a Class 2 amateur radio operator license from  
>Japan, and an Amateur Extra license from the US.

>  
>|                   | SRI International                   |           work:(415)859-2231 |  
>|                   | Speech Technology and Research |           fax:(415)859-5984 |  
>| Goh Kawai   | Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493 USA   |           home:(415)323-7214 |  
>|                   | internet: kawai@speech.sri.com | radio: N6UOK and 7L1FQE |

Sorry, Japan has only 3 1/3+ times as many hams as the US not 5 times,  
I appologize.

Now, what was that about screwing up facts...

Dan Pickersgill   N8PKV   |   Pots have handles,           | 'Climage is what we  
dan@mystis.wariat.org   |Magazines have personals,|   expect, weather is  
ac447@po.cwru.edu       |   Hams have names.           | what we get.' -L. Long

-----

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 1994 06:35:17 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!linley@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Legality of mods?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In ye olden post Anthony\_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio) spake...

>  
>> Advice Please! I am the owner of a Kenwood TH-28A (the one with the 440 MHz rx  
>> [...]  
>>  
>> My question is: What is the legality of \*owning\* a radio intended for amateur  
>> use but capable of transmitting outside of this band. I've heard awful stories  
>> [...]  
>  
>Unfortunately there isn't much you can do about it, except to be conscious  
>of where you're listening and NOT hit the PTT switch. In any case, I know  
>[...]

Heed this advice. However, in a life or death emergency, you can transmit out of band if its the only way you can get help. This is coming from a stale memory but... I remember a story posted here a while back about a ham that was stranded at sea and could not hit any amateur repeaters to call for help but was able to reach a local sherrif's repeater on his out-of-band modified rig. He was rescued and then dragged through the court system because the local sherrifs dept. was outraged. I'm not sure what the outcome was. Anyone know?

--  
Bruce James Robert Linley ---- linley@netcom.com ---- Amateur radio: KE6EQZ

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 94 20:31:02 -0500  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!  
usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CKz8H7.KJ8@world.std.com>, <7a4JHc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,  
<CL2DB0.CLH@world.std.com>  
Subject : Re: Exams are Trivial?

David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> writes:

>It doesn't. When the Code requirement was removed from the Technician  
>license, the ARRL insisted that, since it would become an entry level  
>license, that all of element 3 along with element 2 was just too  
>difficult for an entry level license, and "element 2+" was created.  
>Before that, no one was allowed full power without passing the  
>material on all of element 3, which is no "final exam." They not only  
>elminated the code, they eliminated 3B from the \*old\* technician

>license to give the current tech plus. "Less theory, same great  
>privileges!"

The separation of element 3 into two parts, 3A and 3B, had nothing to do with the no code license rulemaking proceeding. It was done several years earlier (1987), as part of the "Novice enhancement" rulemaking. At the time, ARRL was avidly opposed to creating a code-free license, so they can hardly be accused of advocating splitting up element 3 to make things easier for no code licensees.

..Neil, N3DF

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #52  
\*\*\*\*\*